



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/091,204

03/05/2002

Herbert T. Ong

5681-10600

6378

7590

08/17/2006

Robert C. Kowert  
Conley, Rose & Tayon, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, HAI V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/091,204

Applicant(s)

ONG ET AL.

Examiner

Hai V. Nguyen

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to the communication received on 02 August 2006.
2. Claims 1-48 are presented for examination.
3. The co-pending applications are 10/090,893 and 10/091,203.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, 16, 29, and 42 have been considered but are not persuasive to overcome the prior art.

A. Applicant argues the prior art do not teach, "generates a format ("Examiner interprets the modified format, interim format as formats) for the small device document".

Examiner points out the prior art taught that, "the server sends form to client device (i.e., PDA) in a suitable format" (Mansour, [0161]). "The server 402 transcodes the document formats provided by servers 412, 414, 416 to client formats and sends them to clients 404, 406, 408, 410" (Dutta, Fig. 4, col. 6, lines 16-46).

B. Applicant's argues that the motivations to combine the prior art are improper, not clear and particular in claim 1.

Examiner points out the prior art clearly disclosed that Dutta's teachings of transcoding servers with Mansour's teachings of documents in server formats and small device formats, for the purpose of enabling communications with

Art Unit: 2142

different document formats among the network devices (Dutta, col. 2, lines 22-25).

C. Applicant argues that the prior art does not disclose that, "excluding one or more format features of the document in server format from the document in a small device format" in claim 3.

Examiner points out the prior art discloses the transcoding server receives the information including the data formats acceptable by the client device, translates the client content format to a format compatible with the particular server where the content is located (Dutta, col. 6, lines 1-15).

Thus, the rejection is sustained.

### ***Double Patenting***

5. Claims 1-48 of this application conflict with claims 1-32 of Application No. 10/091203. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 2142

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-48 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-32 of copending Application No. 10/091,203. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

(‘203) Claim 1. A system comprising:

a server configured to store documents in one or more server formats, wherein the documents are available to one or more devices via a network, wherein the server is configured to generate a small device document in a small device format from a document in a server format, wherein, to generate a small device document in a small device format from a document in a server format, the server is further configured to exclude one or more formats for content of the document in the server format from the small device document; and

wherein the server is further configured to provide the small device document to a small device coupled to the server;

the small device, wherein the small device is configured to:

Art Unit: 2142

modify the small device document to produce a modified version of the small device document; and

provide the modified version of the small device document to the server;

wherein the server is further configured to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the small device document, wherein, to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the small device document, the server is further configured to restore the one or more formats for content of the document in the server format excluded from the small device document.

('204) Claim 1. A system comprising:

a server configured to store documents in one or more server formats each supported by one or more applications of the server, wherein the documents are available to one or more devices via a network,

a small device is configured to couple to the server;

wherein the server is further configured to plug a converter module into framework configured to accept one or more pluggable modules;

wherein the converter module is configured to generate a document in a small device format from one of the documents in one of the one or more server formats; and

wherein the server is further configured to provide the document in the small device format to the small device.

('204) Claim 4. the system as recited in claim 1, wherein the converter module is further configured to:

Art Unit: 2142

receive a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device; and

to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the small device document.

('204) Claim 5. the system as recited in claim 4, wherein, to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the small device document, the converter module is further configure to restore the one or more formats for content of the document in the server format excluded from the small device document.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

### ***Double Patenting***

8. Claims 1-48 of this application conflict with claims 1-11, 21-26, 28-35, 37-38 of Application No. 10/090,893. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

9. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory

Art Unit: 2142

obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

10. Claims 1-48 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-11, 21-26, 28-35, 37-38 of copending Application No. 10/090,893. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows:

('204) Claim 1. A system comprising:

a server configured to store documents in one or more server formats each supported by one or more applications of the server, wherein the documents are available to one or more devices via a network,

a small device is configured to couple to the server;

wherein the server is further configured to plug a converter module into framework configured to accept one or more pluggable modules;

wherein the converter module is configured to generate a document in a small device format from one of the documents in one of the one or more server formats; and



Art Unit: 2142

wherein the server is further configured to provide the document in the small device format to the small device.

(‘204) Claim 10. the system as recited in claim 9, wherein the server is further configured to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format from the synchronized version of the document in the interim format.

(‘893) Claim 1. A system comprising:

a server comprising a document in a format supported by the server, wherein the document is available to one or more devices via a network,

a small device is configured to couple to the server;

wherein the server is further configured to generate a small device document in a format supported by the small device from the document in the format supported by the server;

wherein the small device is further configured modify the small device document;

and

wherein the server is further configured to synchronize the document in the format supported by the server with a modified version of the small device document on the small device.

11. Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over **Mansour et al. 2002/0111995 A1** in view of **Dutta et al. US patent # 6,615,212 B1**.

14. As to claim 1, Mansour discloses a system comprising:

a server configured to store documents in one or more server format(s) each supported by one or more application(s) of the server, wherein the documents are available to one or more device(s) via a network (*Internet*);

a small device (*PDA device*) configured to couple to the server;

However, Mansour does not explicitly disclose plugging a converter module into a framework configured to accept one module.

In the same field of endeavor, Dutta discloses the transcoding proxy server including a transcoding framework having transform plugin (*Fig. 6*) or transcoder plugin (*Fig. 7*).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Dutta's teachings of the transcoding framework configured to accept a transform plugin or transcoder plugin (*Dutta, Figures 5, 6*) with the teachings of Mansour, for the *purpose of enabling*

Art Unit: 2142

*communications with different document formats among the network devices (Dutta, col. 2, lines 22-25).*

Mansour-Dutta discloses the converter module (*Dutta, the transcoder plugin*) is configured to generate a document in a small device format (*Dutta, client formats or PDF or HTML documents*) from one of the documents in one of the one server format(s) (*Dutta, postscript documents*) (*Dutta, Figs. 5-8, col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 7, line 13 – col. 9, line 26*); and

Mansour-Dutta discloses providing the document in the small device format to the small device (*Dutta, Figs. 5-8, col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 7, line 13 – col. 9, line 26*).

15. As to claim 2, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server formats include office document formats (*Mansour, server versions [0118]; Dutta, postscript documents*).

16. As to claim 3, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein, to generate a document in one of the one or more small device formats, the converter module is further configured to exclude one or more format features of the document in the server format from the document in the small device format (*Dutta, the transcoding server receives the information including the data formats acceptable by the client device, translates the client content formats to a format compatible with the particular server where the content is located (col. 6, lines 1-15)*).

17. As to claim 4, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the converter module is further is configured to receive a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device (*Mansour, modified version, server versions [0118]*); and

generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the document in the small device format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]; *Dutta*, Figs. 5-8, col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 7, line 13 – col. 9, line 26).

18. As to claim 5, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein, to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the document in the small device format, the converter module is further configured to restore one or more format features of the document in the server format excluded from the document in the small device format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]; *Dutta*, Figs. 5-8, col. 2, lines 38-58; col. 7, line 13 – col. 9, line 26).

19. As to claim 6, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a merger module into the framework (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]); and wherein the merger module is configured to merge the modified version of the document in the server format with the document in the server format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]).

20. As to claim 7, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a differencing module into the framework, and wherein the differencing module is configured to: determine differences between the modified version of the document in the server format and the document in the server format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]); and

Art Unit: 2142

provide the determined differences to the merger module, wherein each determined difference indicates changed content of the modified version of the document in the server format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]).

21. As to claim 8, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein, for each of the determined differences, the merger module is further configured to merge corresponding changed content of the modified version of the document in the server format with the document in the server format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]).

22. As to claim 9, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to: receive a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]);

plug a merger module into the framework (*Mansour*, *merge email*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]);

plug a differencing module into the framework (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]);

generate a version of the document in an interim format from the document in the server format (*Mansour*, *server versionis*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]);

wherein the converter module is further configured to generate a modified version of the document in the interim format from the modified version of the document in the small device format (*Mansour*, *updated version*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]);

wherein the differencing module is configured to determine differences between the modified version of the document in the interim format and the version of the document in the interim format, wherein each determined difference indicates changed

Art Unit: 2142

content of the modified version of the document in the interim format (*Mansour, difference form, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*);

wherein, for each of the determined differences, the merger module is further configured to merge corresponding changed content of the modified version of the document in the interim format with the version of the document in the interim format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the interim format (*Mansour, converted and emerged, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

23. As to claim 10, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format from the synchronized version of the document in the interim format (*Mansour, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

24. As to claim 11, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to: unplug the converter module from the framework; plug a different converter module into the framework (*Mansour, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

25. As to claim 12, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the different converter module is configured to generate documents in a different one of the one or more small device formats from documents in a different one of the one or more server formats; and generate modified versions of documents in the different server format from modified versions of documents in the different small device format (*Mansour, converted, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

Art Unit: 2142

26. As to claim 13, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a merger module into the framework, wherein the merger module is configured to merge modified versions of documents in the server format with corresponding original versions of the documents in the server format to generate synchronized versions of the documents in the server format (*Mansour, merged, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

27. As to claim 14, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a differencing module into the framework, wherein the differencing module is configured to determine differences between modified versions of documents in the server format and corresponding original versions of the documents in the server format (*Mansour, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

28. As to claim 15, Mansour-Dutta discloses, wherein the server comprises a converter factory configured to generate the converter module, the merger module and the differencing module for plugging into the framework (*Mansour, converted, merged, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

29. Claim 16 is corresponding apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 1.

30. Claims 17-24 are similar limitations of claims 3-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 3-10.

31. Claim 25 is similar limitations of claims 11, 12; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 11, 12.

Art Unit: 2142

32. Claims 26-28 are similar limitations of claims 13-15; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 13-15.

33. Claim 29 is corresponding method claim of claims 1, 3; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 1, 3.

34. Claim 30 is similar limitations of claims 4, 5; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 4, 5.

35. Claims 31-32 are similar limitations of claims 6-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 6-7.

36. Claims 33-34 are similar limitations of claims 9-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 9-10.

37. Claim 35 is similar limitations of claims 9, 7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 9, 7.

38. Claim 36 is similar limitation of claim 10; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 10.

39. Claims 37-38 are similar limitations of claims 12-13; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 12-13.

40. Claim 39 is similar limitations of claims 11, 12; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 11, 12.

41. Claim 40 is similar limitations of claim 9; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 9.

42. Claim 41 is similar limitations of claim 13; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 13.



Art Unit: 2142

43. Claim 42 is corresponding article of manufacture claim of claims 1, 3; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 1, 3.

44. Claim 43 is similar limitations of claims 4, 5; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 4, 5.

45. Claim 44 is similar limitations of claim 7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 7.

46. Claim 45 is similar limitations of claims 9, 10; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 9, 10.

47. Claim 46 is similar limitations of claims 12, 11; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 10, 11.

48. Claims 47, 48 are similar limitations of claims 12, 13; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 12, 13.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

49. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

50. Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over **Mansour et al. 2002/0111995 A1** in view of **Sahota et al. 2002/0111995 A1**.

51. As to claim 1, Mansour discloses a system comprising:

a server configured to store documents in one or more server format(s) each supported by one or more application(s) of the server, wherein the documents are available to one or more device(s) via a network (*Internet*);

a small device (*PDA device*) configured to couple to the server;

However, Mansour does not explicitly disclose the server is configured to plug a converter module into a framework configured to accept one or more module(s).

In the same field of endeavor, Sahota discloses that, "HTML convert 208 creates XML data files 208a based on the conversion rules in the repository and creates XML data files and streams that are used by content converter 204 and content generator 203 subsystems to create dynamically content for specific platforms or formats and device frameworks. HTML converter 208 is designed to be extended using a plug in architecture for adding on new conversion modules, (paragraphs [0034], [0060])".

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Sahota's teachings of

Art Unit: 2142

HTML converter 208 is designed to be extended using a plug in architecture for adding on new conversion modules (*Sahota, [0060]*) with the teachings of Mansour, for the purpose of displaying on multiple types of platforms or formats e.g., HTML, portable document format, Postscript, or other like formats (*Sahota, [0034]*).

Mansour-Sahota discloses the converter module is configured to generate a document in a small device format from one of the documents in one of the one server format(s) (*Sahota, [0034]-[0035], [0060]-[0064]*); and

Mansour-Sahota discloses providing the document in the small device format to the small device (*Sahota, [0034]-[0035], [0060]-[0064]*).

52. As to claim 2, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein the server formats include office document formats (*Mansour, server versions [0118]*).

53. As to claim 3, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein, to generate a document in one of the one or more small device formats, the converter module is further configured to exclude one or more format features of the document in the server format from the document in the small device format (*Sahota, content converter 204 and content generator 203 create dynamically content for specific platforms or formats, [0034], [0060]; In one embodiment, selected tags, styles, and content are either replaced or removed from the HTML page [0066]*).

54. As to claim 4, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein the converter module is further is configured to receive a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device (*Mansour, modified version, server versions [0118]*); and

generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the document in the small device format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]).

55. As to claim 5, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein, to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the document in the small device format, the converter module is further configured to restore one or more format features of the document in the server format excluded from the document in the small device format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]).

56. As to claim 6, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a merger module into the framework (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]); and wherein the merger module is configured to merge the modified version of the document in the server format with the document in the server format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]).

57. As to claim 7, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a differencing module into the framework, and wherein the differencing module is configured to: determine differences between the modified version of the document in the server format and the document in the server format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]); and provide the determined differences to the merger module, wherein each determined difference indicates changed content of the modified version of the document in the server format (*Mansour*, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]).

Art Unit: 2142

58. As to claim 8, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein, for each of the determined differences, the merger module is further configured to merge corresponding changed content of the modified version of the document in the server format with the document in the server format (*Mansour, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

59. As to claim 9, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein the server is further configured to: receive a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device (*Mansour, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*);

plug a merger module into the framework (*Mansour, merge email, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*);

plug a differencing module into the framework (*Mansour, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*);

generate a version of the document in an interim format from the document in the server format (*Mansour, server versions, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*);

wherein the converter module is further configured to generate a modified version of the document in the interim format from the modified version of the document in the small device format (*Mansour, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*);

wherein the differencing module is configured to determine differences between the modified version of the document in the interim format and the version of the document in the interim format, wherein each determined difference indicates changed content of the modified version of the document in the interim format (*Mansour, difference form, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*);

wherein, for each of the determined differences, the merger module is further configured to merge corresponding changed content of the modified version of the document in the interim format with the version of the document in the interim format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the interim format (*Mansour, converted and emerged, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

60. As to claim 10, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein the server is further configured to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format from the synchronized version of the document in the interim format (*Mansour, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

61. As to claim 11, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein the server is further configured to unplug the converter module from the framework; plug a different converter module into the framework (*Mansour, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]; Sahota, adding on new conversion modules, [0060]*).

62. As to claim 12, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein the different converter module is configured to generate documents in a different one of the one or more small device formats from documents in a different one of the one or more server formats; and generate modified versions of documents in the different server format from modified versions of documents in the different small device format (*Mansour, converted, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

63. As to claim 13, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a merger module into the framework, wherein the merger module is configured to merge modified versions of documents in the server format with

Art Unit: 2142

corresponding original versions of the documents in the server format to generate synchronized versions of the documents in the server format (*Mansour, merged, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

64. As to claim 14, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a differencing module into the framework, wherein the differencing module is configured to determine differences between modified versions of documents in the server format and corresponding original versions of the documents in the server format (*Mansour, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

65. As to claim 15, Mansour-Sahota discloses, wherein the server comprises a converter factory configured to generate the converter module, the merger module and the differencing module for plugging into the framework (*Mansour, converted, merged, updated version, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*).

66. Claim 16 is corresponding apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 1.

67. Claims 17-24 are similar limitations of claims 3-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 3-10.

68. Claim 25 is similar limitations of claims 11, 12; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 11, 12.

69. Claims 26-28 are similar limitations of claims 13-15; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 13-15.

70. Claim 29 is corresponding method claim of claims 1, 3; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 1, 3.

Art Unit: 2142

71. Claim 30 is similar limitations of claims 4, 5; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 4, 5.

72. Claims 31-32 are similar limitations of claims 6-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 6-7.

73. Claims 33-34 are similar limitations of claims 9-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 9-10.

74. Claim 35 is similar limitations of claims 9, 7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 9, 7.

75. Claim 36 is similar limitation of claim 10; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 10.

76. Claims 37-38 are similar limitations of claims 12-13; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 12-13.

77. Claim 39 is similar limitations of claims 11, 12; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 11, 12.

78. Claim 40 is similar limitations of claim 9; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 9.

79. Claim 41 is similar limitations of claim 13; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 13.

80. Claim 42 is corresponding article of manufacture claim of claims 1, 3; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 1, 3.

81. Claim 43 is similar limitations of claims 4, 5; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 4, 5.



Art Unit: 2142

82. Claim 44 is similar limitations of claim 7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 7.

83. Claim 45 is similar limitations of claims 9, 10; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 9, 10.

84. Claim 46 is similar limitations of claims 12, 11; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 10, 11.

85. Claims 47, 48 are similar limitations of claims 12, 13; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 12, 13.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

86. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102(e) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

87. Claims 1-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Sahota et al. 2002/0111995 A1**.

88. As to claim 1, Sahota substantially teaches the invention as claimed, including a system comprising:

a server (*Fig. 2A*) configured to store documents (*XML files or documents, [0060]*) in one or more server format(s) each supported by one or more application(s) (*one or more XSL application(s)/service(s)*) of the server, wherein the documents are available

Art Unit: 2142

to one or more device(s) (*mobile or electronic portable devices, PDAs*) via a network (*Internet*);

a small device (*PDA device*) configured to couple to the server (Fig. 2A, [0027];

a small device configured to couple to the server (*Fig. 1, set-top box device*);

wherein the server is configured to plugging a converter module (*templates or conversion modules*) into a framework (*a plug in architecture*) configured to accept one or more pluggable module(s) (*adding on new conversion modules, [0034], [0035], [0060]*).

wherein the converter module is configured to generate a document in a small device format (*Sahota, server 110 can generate a standardized data stream from the XML file for display on multiple type of platforms or formats, for example, potable document format, [0034], [0035], [0060]*); and

wherein the server is further configured to provide the document in the small device format to the small device (*[0034], [0035], [0060]*).

89. As to claim 2, Sahota discloses, wherein the server formats include office document formats (*PDF or HTML documents or Postscript formats, [0069]*).

90. As to claim 3, Sahota discloses, wherein, to generate a document in one of the one or more small device formats, the converter module is further configured to exclude one or more format features of the document in the server format from the document in the small device format (*Sahota, content converter 204 and content generator 203 create dynamically content for specific platforms or formats, [0034], [0060]; In one*

Art Unit: 2142

*embodiment, selected tags, styles, and content are either replaced or removed from the HTML page [0066]).*

91. As to claim 4, Sahota discloses, wherein the converter module is further is configured to receive a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device (*fine tuned delivery of specific versions, [0054]*); and

generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the document in the small device format (*creating multiple platform and language versions, [0054], [0055], [0056], [0062], [0092], [0093]*).

92. As to claim 5, Sahota discloses, wherein, to generate a modified version of the document in the server format from the modified version of the document in the small device format, the converter module is further configured to restore one or more format features of the document in the server format excluded from the document in the small device format (*the latest version is obtained, [0092]-[0093]*).

93. As to claim 6, Sahota discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a merger module into the framework; and wherein the merger module is configured to merge the modified version of the document in the server format with the document in the server format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format (*updating and refreshing an item in cache, [0092]-[0093]*).

94. As to claim 7, Sahota discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a differencing module into the framework, and wherein the differencing module is configured to determine differences between the modified version of the document in the server format and the document in the server format (*the cached version is*

Art Unit: 2142

*compared to the source version and the cache is updated as necessary, [0092]-[0093]);*  
and provide the determined differences to the merger module, wherein each determined difference indicates changed content of the modified version of the document in the server format ([0092]-[0093]).

95. As to claim 8, Sahota discloses, wherein, for each of the determined differences, the merger module is further configured to merge corresponding changed content of the modified version of the document in the server format with the document in the server format ([0092]-[0093]).

96. As to claim 9, Sahota discloses, receiving a modified version of the document in the small device format from the small device (*updated version, [0092], [0093]*).

plug a merger module into the framework (*adding new conversion modules, [0060]-[0063]*);

plug a differencing module into the framework (*Mansour, [0067]-[0135], [0153]-[0167], [0185]-[0218]*);

generate a version of the document in an interim format from the document in the server format (*creating multiple platform and language versions, [0054], [0055], [0056], [0062], [0092], [0093]*);

wherein the converter module is further configured to generate a modified version of the document in the interim format from the modified version of the document in the small device format ([0054], [0055], [0056], [0062], [0092], [0093]);

wherein the differencing module is configured to determine differences between the modified version of the document in the interim format and the version of the

Art Unit: 2142

document in the interim format, wherein each determined difference indicates changed content of the modified version of the document in the interim format (*creating multiple platform and language versions, [0054], [0055], [0056], [0062], [0092], [0093]*);

wherein, for each of the determined differences, the merger module is further configured to merge corresponding changed content of the modified version of the document in the interim format with the version of the document in the interim format to generate a synchronized version of the document in the interim format (*[0054], [0055], [0056], [0062], [0092], [0093]*).

97. As to claim 10, Sahota discloses wherein the server is further configured to generate a synchronized version of the document in the server format from the synchronized version of the document in the interim format (*updating and refreshing an item in cache, [0092]-[0093]*).

98. As to claim 11, Sahota discloses, wherein the server is further configured to: unplug the converter module from the framework; plug a different converter module into the framework (*updating and refreshing an item in cache, [0054], [0055], [0056], [0062], [0092], [0093]*).

99. As to claim 12, Sahota discloses, wherein the different converter module is configured to generate documents in a different one of the one or more small device formats from documents in a different one of the one or more server formats; and generate modified versions of documents in the different server format from modified versions of documents in the different small device format (*updating and refreshing an item in cache, [0054], [0055], [0056], [0062], [0092], [0093]*).

Art Unit: 2142

100. As to claim 13, Sahota discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a merger module into the framework, wherein the merger module is configured to merge modified versions of documents in the server format with corresponding original versions of the documents in the server format to generate synchronized versions of the documents in the server format (*Sahota, consolidating, [0076]*).

101. As to claim 14, Sahota discloses, wherein the server is further configured to plug a differencing module into the framework, wherein the differencing module is configured to determine differences between modified versions of documents in the server format and corresponding original versions of the documents in the server format (*updating and refreshing an item in cache, [0054], [0055], [0056], [0062], [0092], [0093]*).

102. As to claim 15, Sahota discloses, wherein the server comprises a converter factory configured to generate the converter module, the merger module and the differencing module for plugging into the framework (*converted, merged, updated version, [0054], [0055], [0056], [0062], [0092], [0093]*).

103. Claim 16 is corresponding apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 1.

104. Claims 17-24 are similar limitations of claims 3-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 3-10.

105. Claim 25 is similar limitations of claims 11, 12; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 11, 12.

106. Claims 26-28 are similar limitations of claims 13-15; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 13-15.

Art Unit: 2142

107. Claim 29 is corresponding method claim of claims 1, 3; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 1, 3.

108. Claim 30 is similar limitations of claims 4, 5; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 4, 5.

109. Claims 31-32 are similar limitations of claims 6-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 6-7.

110. Claims 33-34 are similar limitations of claims 9-10; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 9-10.

111. Claim 35 is similar limitations of claims 9, 7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 9, 7.

112. Claim 36 is similar limitation of claim 10; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 10.

113. Claims 37-38 are similar limitations of claims 12-13; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 12-13.

114. Claim 39 is similar limitations of claims 11, 12; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 11, 12.

115. Claim 40 is similar limitations of claim 9; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 9.

116. Claim 41 is similar limitations of claim 13; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 13.

117. Claim 42 is corresponding article of manufacture claim of claims 1, 3; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 1, 3.

Art Unit: 2142

118. Claim 43 is similar limitations of claims 4, 5; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 4, 5.

119. Claim 44 is similar limitations of claim 7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 7.

120. Claim 45 is similar limitations of claims 9, 10; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claim 9, 10.

121. Claim 46 is similar limitations of claims 12, 11; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale as in claims 10, 11.

122. Claims 47, 48 are similar limitations of claims 12, 13; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale as in claims 12, 13.

123. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this action.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai V. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3901. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-3:30 Mon-Fri.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hai V. Nguyen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2142



THOR VU  
P.E.